Responses to Questions about Stage 4 Studies
November 28, 2000

(Revised and updated - December 30, 2000)

On October 10, 2000 a series of questionnaires based on the studies completed during the Review's Stage 4 (practical analysis of recommendations) was posted on the ACRGR web site <www.acrgr.org>. All municipalities in the capital region, and all stakeholder organizations registered with the Review, were notified of the opportunity to complete the questionnaires. A media release was also issued. The web site questionnaires were available until November 8, 2000. On November 20, 2000 a draft summary of the responses was forwarded to each municipality for verification. Any comments or corrections received up to December 30, 2000 have been incorporated into this document.

This is the summary of the responses received both from municipalities and from other stakeholders. This information will be used by the Project Chairman in his Final Report of the Review.

Interpretation of Summary

"No response" can be interpreted in two ways:

1. The following municipalities chose not to provide a formal response to the web site questionnaires from either their administration or their council. Council members could respond on an individual basis. No response is expected.

   Fort Saskatchewan
   Legal
   New Sarepta
   Stony Plain

OR

2. Some web site questionnaires were completed but a response was not provided for all questionnaires or questions.

"NSR" (no specific response) can be interpreted as follows:

If a municipality communicated with the Project Chairman by some other means than the web site questionnaires (perhaps a letter), their submission was reviewed, interpreted and is included in this document. NSR means that a response to the specific web site question could not be determined.

Note: If a municipality provided correspondence and also completed the web site questionnaires, both types of responses were interpreted and included in this document.

Please also see "Additional Comments" at the end of the report for general observations from municipalities.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1. Do you agree that there should be a partnership between the business sector and municipal government in the region to establish regional economic development priorities and strategies?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Parkland Cty	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Warburg		●
Munic 14	12	2
Others 19	17	2

COMMENTS

AGREE

Strathcona County
- A flexible, multi-sectoral partnership will ensure strategies are developed to meet common goals and that the resultant initiatives are supported. Regional business leaders can bring an added perspective to the development of strategies that will aid business attraction and retention.

Gibbons
- Municipality should be the enabler. Economic Development Officers from region to perhaps brainstorm with Chambers. Who's going to pay? Must be a win/win situation.

Leduc
- Leduc/Nisku EDA is an excellent example of what can be achieved through municipal/business/government partnership.

Thorsby
- Partnerships already exist.

Calmar
- As a region this would be advantageous. However, it would be interesting to see how each municipality views this initiative long term in their visioning and budget process.

Spruce Grove
- Support the Greater Edmonton Competitiveness Strategy

Sturgeon County
- Process to look at land use bylaws and ensure complementary to one another.

Bon Accord
- Providing it goes through ACRA and in partnership with the Province.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- RIAM offers best opportunity for a cooperative and coordinated approach to economic development.
- Sub regional partnerships have been extremely effective.
- The region is already a leader in economic growth areas and business opportunities.

Warburg
- Business should be able to make recommendations but not control municipal government.

OTHER RESPONSES: 19 others responded.

AGREE
- Should be a low priority for resources of region. Unless we have a healthy environment, promoting business growth can be counterproductive.
- Economic development should be business lead and municipally facilitated.
- Municipal government must provide the voice of citizenry to the business community.
- The business sector plays a key role in (what will and should) develop in the region, as well as how our present businesses/industries can expand.
- Partnership implies equal decision making. Business should have the opportunity to provide significant input, but not necessarily decision making-this is why we elect representatives to govern our affairs.
- Common sense. What disadvantage is there to a partnership?

DISAGREE
- EDE is in this process right now. Duplication would be redundant. Implementation is the key.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

2. Do you agree that an economic development agency that coordinates regional economic development priorities and strategies is desirable for the region in the long term?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Leduc		●
Parkland Cty		●
Warburg		●
Munic 14	10	4
Others 19	12	7

COMMENTS

AGREE

Strathcona County
- ACRA has demonstrated its ability to function effectively as both a regional leader and a partner in addressing economic development issues and should take the lead role in the coordination of regional economic development and tourism projects.

Gibbons
- Who's paying and how? Is ACRA not playing this role? Heartland - how does it fit into this?

Calmar
- Long term visioning of the region is a must. All members could benefit.

Spruce Grove
- Provide a one-stop access to the greater region.

Sturgeon County
- However, further study and analysis with ACRA.

Bon Accord
- Go with ACRA and EDE and the Province.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The formation of one agency would weaken the synergies that have developed from the diversity of regional partnerships and possibly lead to stagnation.

Parkland County
- A new development agency is not required. ACRA is a better and less expensive option to pursue regional economic development initiatives.

Leduc
- A sub-regional approach is preferred. Bigger not always better.

Warburg
- Development of another agency raises concern. Can we not utilize what is already in place?

OTHER RESPONSES: 19 others responded.

AGREE
- Economic development needs to contribute to, not detract from, ecosystem health as measured by long term biodiversity protection.
- An economic development agency should be made up of regional business interests and not municipally based.
- It makes sense that we work as a region to attract and grow business and that we put aside self interest for the good of the entire region.
- Such an agency is necessary because we are still trying to overcome the effects of the controlled growth of the industrial revolution.
- Absolutely - the Edmonton region is competing with other regions in Canada, USA and globally. We require a regional focus coordinated by a regional authority, with representation from variou...
- We need one regional agency, not several the way it is now (i.e., EDE, MEEDT, etc.).
- Having everyone work together for a common goal just makes sense!

DISAGREE
- No, it would become another pork barrel posting in time.
- Each solution should be individual and reflective of the constituent components of a region. At present this region is a construct of a diverse set of economic development components and municipalities. Should the solution be something totally on the oppo...
- You can study all your life yet never make a sale.

TRANSPORTATION

1. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should have a transportation plan that addresses air, rail, transit and vehicle issues and provides direction beyond the next five years?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Munic 14	12	2
Others 22	21	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Strathcona County
- Enhancements to the plan should include cross-references to studies completed on regional air and rail transportation. The long-range plan also needs to be aligned with the long term vision for the region.

Warburg
- We must try to find a way to educate our population in use of mass transit, car pooling, etc.

Sturgeon County
- Important to do longer range planning. Makes our local plan easier to dovetail with the regional plan. Opportunity to look at the regional benefits in respect of cooperating regionally.

Gibbons
- Very important. ACRA has worked this issue to some degree. All modes of transportation are significant.

Thorsby
- Already exists through ACRA.

Morinville
- This has been done. ACRA transportation planning process.

Spruce Grove
- Part of "smart growth."

Bon Accord
- Should be dealt with through ACRA.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Partnerships should be encouraged on a project specific basis to facilitate particular development.
- Edmonton Regional Airports Authority is responsible for air service and although municipalities could have input, a separate plan is not necessary.
- Municipalities have limited ability to influence rail service.

Parkland County
- 3-5 years is a realistic time frame for project planning.
- Another transportation plan incorporating air, rail and transit is all too encompassing and much of it is beyond the jurisdiction of the region.
- The current authorities are very capable of long term planning and specialized services such as transit can reviewed by those affected.
- ACRA is a legitimate forum to discuss these issues.

OTHER RESPONSES: 22 others responded.

AGREE
- A transportation plan should be longer than five years. One must budget for all Municipal Services.
- The region should undertake a regional transportation plan that is more that just a roadway construction schedule. The plan should address the implications of transportation and land uses such that we can achieve more effective use of our resources.
- If we are not prepared to think regionally on hard infrastructure we have no business continuing as independent municipal entities.
- The impetus should be towards a lessening dependence on personal automobile use within metropolitan areas.

- Very important for the movement of products, services and people. A tremendous amount of tax dollars will be spent in the near future. These dollars must be spent according to a plan that has been developed with a regional focus in order for dev...
- Long-term regional planning, while filled with many pitfalls, at least forces municipalities to identify, consider and coordinate the variables and the issues. While the plan may miss or change course mid-stream, it still provides a valuable record and a ...
- Very important to have adequate public transportation as well as bike lanes on roads or sidewalks for easy and enjoyable commuting by bicycle.
- Especially in regard to mass public transit and improvement of current transportation services.
- I have not read the transportation plan but can safely assume ALL issues have been covered. I fully support a regional transportation plan that addresses issues all municipalities have.

DISAGREE

- No, 23 municipalities cannot independently develop a holistic regional transportation plan. We need a regional planning authority with responsibility for land use/transportation planning.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

1. Do you agree that a regional GIS system is feasible and desirable?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
St. Albert	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Munic 16	14	2
Others 22	20	2

COMMENTS

AGREE

St. Albert
- Recommend regional GIS system be integrated with provincial "one window to government" initiative (in partnership with AUMA).
- Current efforts of individual municipalities to institute GIS systems must be reviewed immediately to ensure minimal loss of investment and that planning is consistent with regional direction.

Strathcona County
- A powerful tool to assist as we continue to build and strengthen regional coordination. Feasibility will be dependent upon financial support from the Province to assist with equipment and training for smaller communities and with data conversion costs for those with GIS systems.

Warburg
- Should be done cooperatively and possibly on a cost share basis for small communities.

Gibbons
- Desirable but it is feasible.

Calmar
- It may be difficult taking into consideration that many municipalities may have invested capital dollars into existing or proposed systems to date.

Spruce Grove
- Reflects Federal "Connecting Canadians" initiative.

Bon Accord
- As long as smaller communities can afford it.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- No reason for municipalities of the region to measure each other.
- Linkages should be available between municipalities, but no need for a centralized body to coordinate.
- Municipalities should be able to put in place what they want and can afford.

Parkland County
- No evidence is presented that a regional GIS is feasible or desirable and no examples are given of "significant issues" that would be resolved.
- No examples are given of why a regional GIS system would be superior to existing systems with coordination.
- Costs would be significant both for initial investment and implementation over a period of years.
- Do not support formation of a regional body to promote and oversee a "regional system."

OTHER RESPONSES: 22 others responded.

AGREE
- GIS is a very powerful tool that will help the capital region move into the 21st century.
- Agree with reservations. Noone in St. Albert needs or wants to know much about Leduc (infrastructure, land parcels, traffic signs, etc.). The cost of gaining common standards among the municipalities with GIS would not ...
- This is the key that will open the door to ensure that this region can compete in the global economy.
- Why not pool resources as opposed to segmenting them!

DISAGREE
- GIS information is best compiled and used at the local municipal level.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

2a. Do you agree that a regional GIS system should be guided by a shared vision and common purpose amongst stakeholders?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Munic 14	12	2
Others 22	21	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Bon Accord
- Provided all stakeholders and the Province are involved.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The benefits and advantages of a regional GIS system of a magnitude of some 10,000 sq. km. is questionable.

Parkland County
- Vision statement options given are far reaching and sometimes contradictory.

OTHER RESPONSES: 22 others responded.

AGREE
- This is a no brainer. If there is no common purpose, nothing will happen.
- Motherhood and apple pie.
- All common sense ideas!

DISAGREE
- Stakeholders have been very narrowly defined as the 23 municipalities, rather than citizens of the region. Need to deal more directly with the 900,000 citizens in the region.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

2b. Do you agree that a regional GIS system should be a world class system based on a fully integrated regional initiative?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Warburg		●
Munic 14	11	3
Others 21	20	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Thorsby
- Do not necessarily need to become a "World Leader." Smaller municipalities do not have this luxury.

Bon Accord
- Not convinced we have to go world class.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The benefits and advantages of a regional GIS system of a magnitude of some 10,000 sq. km. is questionable.

Parkland County
- Contradicts 2(f) - does this assume the existing individual systems are "world class"?

OTHER RESPONSES: 22 others responded.

AGREE
- This is motherhood and apple pie.
- All common sense ideas!

DISAGREE
- Is someone's dream of chasing technology around. The only items where benefits exceed costs are some data themes that should be jointly maintained and shared.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

2c. Do you agree that a regional GIS system should provide a broad range of public information accessible over the Internet?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Warburg		●
Munic 14	11	3
Others 21	20	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Bon Accord
- Providing guidelines are set down by all municipalities.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The benefits and advantages of a regional GIS system of a magnitude of some 10,000 sq. km. is questionable.

Parkland County
- Benefits have not been explained.

OTHER RESPONSES: 21 others responded.

AGREE
- This is motherhood and apple pie.
- All common sense ideas!
- This question may be slightly misleading as GIS tends to illustrate a broader set of spatial or mapping related information rather than only public information.

DISAGREE
- Inform.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

2d. Do you agree that a regional GIS system should be a regional Intranet for stakeholders to share internally focussed data?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
Parkland Cty	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Munic 13	12	1
Others 21	20	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Sturgeon County
- Support a system that allows participating municipalities to have a common database and able to access one another's systems.

Bon Accord
- Assuming access can be made to all other systems.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The benefits and advantages of a regional GIS system of a magnitude of some 10,000 sq. km. is questionable.

OTHER RESPONSES: 21 others responded.

AGREE
- This is motherhood and apple pie.
- All common sense ideas!

DISAGREE - No comment.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

2e. Do you agree that a regional GIS system should serve all municipalities in the region (large and small)?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Munic 14	12	2
Others 22	21	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Sturgeon County
- Participation should be voluntary, not mandatory.

Bon Accord
- Only if voluntary.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The benefits and advantages of a regional GIS system of a magnitude of some 10,000 sq. km. is questionable.

Parkland County
- With the distance and remoteness of some areas of rural municipalities, it may not be practical to serve all municipalities.

OTHER RESPONSES: 22 others responded.

AGREE - No comment.

DISAGREE:
- Stakeholders have been narrowly defined as the 23 municipalities. We need to deal more directly with the 900,000 citizens in the region.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

2f. Do you agree that a regional GIS system should integrate, not replace, existing computing and GIS infrastructure of member municipalities?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Munic 14	12	2
Others 21	21	0

COMMENTS

AGREE

Spruce Grove
- The proposed new service has the benefit of not replacing existing systems or dealing with historical barriers.

Redwater
- Integration, not replacement, is of great importance.

Bon Accord
- Providing this can be done.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The benefits and advantages of a regional GIS system of a magnitude of some 10,000 sq. km. is questionable.

Parkland County
- Contradicts 2(b) - does this assume the existing individual systems are "world class"?

OTHER RESPONSES: 21 others responded.

AGREE
- The main emphasis should be placed on coordinating existing systems.
- All common sense ideas.
- Motherhood and apple pie.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

2g. Do you agree that a regional GIS system should be an Internet-based system accessible by browsers and using Internet protocols?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
Parkland Cty	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
St. Albert	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Munic 13	12	1
Others 20	19	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Bon Accord

- But should not be only method of accessibility.

DISAGREE

Leduc County

- The benefits and advantages of a regional GIS system of a magnitude of some 10,000 sq. km. is questionable.

OTHER RESPONSES: 20 others responded.

AGREE

- Communication should not be limited to the Internet as not everyone is computer proficient.
- Motherhood and apple pie.
- All common sense ideas!

DISAGREE - No comment.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

2h. Do you agree that a regional GIS system should adopt a common approach to information standards and management processes?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
Parkland Cty	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Warburg		●
Munic 13	11	2
Others 21	21	0

COMMENTS

AGREE

Bon Accord

- Providing all municipalities have input.

DISAGREE

Leduc County

- The benefits and advantages of a regional GIS system of a magnitude of some 10,000 sq. km. is questionable.

OTHER RESPONSES: 21 others responded.

AGREE

- Motherhood and apple pie.
- All common sense ideas!
- A GIS is an important information tool and must be developed with a common accurate geographic base. Preferably the various attributes should have common features so that they may be integrated across municipal boundaries.
- There needs to be more standards set and much more uniformity in the region in many areas that would be a benefit to business, industry and citizens.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

3. Do you agree that the provincial government should be one of the financial supporters of the development of a regional GIS system?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Leduc Cty	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Gibbons		●
Parkland Cty		●
Munic 15	13	2
Others 21	18	3

COMMENTS

AGREE

Leduc County
- Provincial funding should be provided on a project specific basis.

Strathcona County
- Too costly for smaller municipalities without provincial assistance. Data conversion will also be a significant start-up cost for those with GIS systems. A financial contribution from the Province is warranted as they will also gain significantly from a regional GIS system.

Sturgeon County
- Province should be a partner.

Spruce Grove
- Province should be sole financial supporters.

Leduc
- Primary funding source.

Thorsby
- Province should be a major financial supporter.

Calmar
- Land titles is a good example of a department moving to a fully IT basis system that is functional and user based.

Spruce Grove
- Also Federal support.

Bon Accord
- Provided there is sufficient funding from the Province.

DISAGREE

Parkland County
- The main selling point seems to be that someone else will pay for this project. If the Province does not fund adequately, perhaps a more critical analysis would take place.

Gibbons
- Province should be sole financial supporter.

OTHER RESPONSES: 21 others responded

AGREE
- All levels of government and private sector should be considered as possible investors in a regional GIS.
- Everyone in the region would like to have municipalities pry money from the Province. Is it likely to happen? NOT!
- Provincial funding for the regional sewage plant is comparable. It would not have happened if the Province did not fund it.
- Province's money is as good as anybody's. However, major corporations like EPCOR and Telus have a lot to gain and a lot to contribute (not just funding).
- In a leading role, as otherwise too costly for smaller municipalities.
- If it reduces the need to fund individual GIS systems, then the Province should fund a regional GIS system.
- Province should be major supporter and should be 100% responsible for start up cost.

DISAGREE
- It would be nice if the Province would help but you can't count on that sort of thing.
- GIS systems should be developed locally and financed locally.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

4. Which of the three approaches to GIS development suggested for our region do you support?

a) Municipalities in the region continue to develop their own GIS systems independently. Each municipality determines who benefits. OR

b) Municipalities in the region with GIS capacity agree to share data. Municipalities with limited resources may participate later. Participating municipalities benefit. OR

c) Municipalities in the region agree to share data and invest in bot GIS and an integrated Intranet. Sharing information serves the needs of citizens, industry, government and investors in the region. OR

d) None of the above.

Municipality	a	b	c	d
Devon	NSR			
Edmonton	NSR			
St. Albert	NSR			
Ft. Sask	No response			
Legal	No response			
New Sarepta	No response			
Stony Plain	No response			
Parkland Cty	●			
Beaumont		●		
Leduc Cty		●		
Morinville		●		
Spruce Grove		●		
Warburg		●		
Bon Accord			●	
Calmar			●	
Gibbons			●	
Leduc			●	
Redwater			●	
Strathcona Cty			●	
Sturgeon Cty			●	
Thorsby			●	
Munic 14	1	5	8	
Others 21	1	6	14	

COMMENTS

OPTION A

Parkland County
- Significant costs to integrate the entire region have not been adequately analyzed relative to the benefits. Links to each municipality's web site provide the public with access to the data deemed necessary and practical by each municipality.

OPTION B

Leduc County
- Municipalities should not be forced to participate if they cannot afford it. This would not preclude municipal partnerships from developing.

Warburg
- Participation should be cost efficient to smaller communities (i.e., cost sharing or inter-municipal links).

Spruce Grove
- Support B or C depending on readiness of region to support initiative, collectively or as a sub-group.

OPTION C

Strathcona County

Support this approach provided that:
- System is not centrally managed. Each municipality would have independent but compatible systems, coordinated where appropriate.
- Capital and operational costs are identified and approved by member municipalities prior to commencing initiative.

Sturgeon County
- It can also serve our economic development business opportunities.

Gibbons
- Benefits everyone provided the Province pays.

Thorsby
- Costs could be based on equalized assessment.

OTHER RESPONSES: 21 others responded.

OPTION A
- Each municipality should develop its own, depending on help from municipal governments that already have GIS in place.

OPTION B
- As a minimum. As a preferred or optimal choice. Meets vision more comprehensively.
- This is as close a choice as what I have promoted in previous comments.
- Need to build the foundation first.

OPTION C
- Don't separate the haves from have nots. Everyone stands to benefit from GIS, not strictly on Intranet-also available to the public on Internet.
- Do not support this approach as it will be difficult to develop true regional databases and will be a more costly approach. In order to be beneficial and truly regional ALL municipalities must participate fully.
- You can't wait for the slowest decision maker to come on board - you must get on with it either individually or collectively.
- With strong financial support from Province.
- Sharing resources means sharing costs to the eventual paying customers, the taxpayer!

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

5. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should design a GIS system that allows citizens, developers, and investors to conduct business on line with any municipality in the region?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Warburg		●
Munic 14	11	3
Others 19	17	2

COMMENTS

AGREE

Strathcona County
- Any regional GIS system must have appropriate safeguards and protocols.

Gibbons
- Important for virtual city halls to be made effective for use of today's technology.

Leduc
- GIS is land-based and shouldn't be confused with other eGovt applications.

Spruce Grove
- Will require significant improvements to data base. Fundamental challenge for many municipalities.

Bon Accord
- Providing there is provincial funding.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The benefits and advantages of a regional GIS system of a magnitude of some 10,000 sq. km. is questionable.

Parkland County
- All municipalities may not require or desire a system where everyone conducts business on-line. Smaller municipalities do not have the staff to maintain such a system.

OTHER RESPONSES: 19 others responded.

AGREE
- However, FOIP or other legislation and ownership issues will greatly impact the openness of sharing.
- Can't imagine why we wouldn't be doing this now. It's important that we overcome the parochial tendencies of municipal politicians. Turf protection is only valid where local municipalities wish to offer their own local level of soft services (e.g., recrea...
- This is a very lofty and far-sighted goal in these changing times.
- This is the ideal situation but costs would keep some municipalities from participating.
- This would allow a true regional perspective and create a positive image of our region in many respects.
- Primary purpose of municipal GIS should be for municipal needs. However, the information must be made available to outside users.
- Only if it is closely monitored and everyone has equal opportunity!

DISAGREE
- Way overkill for some of the small municipalities like Bon Accord. (When was the last time there was any developer or investor who had the capability of doing this?) Each municipality should decide if this is the best use of their resources, based on a ...
- Keep independent.

SPECIFIED FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

1. Do you agree that the ability of any municipality to respond to a local emergency should be based on service requirements and best intervention time, not on map lines?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Gibbons	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Munic 14	12	2
Others 20	19	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Sturgeon County
- Subject to satisfactory bilateral agreements.
- Direct communication between all agencies is essential and the Province or a regional plan should fund this initiative. Technology exists but the cost is unfair for one municipality to absorb.
- Sharing of response resources has certain value. A more thorough study is required to identify possible financial and operational efficiencies.

Strathcona County
- Municipal boundaries are currently permeable, based on existing mutual aid agreements. These agreements should be mandatory between municipalities sharing common borders.

Leduc
- Mutual aid and automatic aid agreements meet this requirement.

Warburg
- Emergency services should not include ambulances-that should be placed under the Alberta Health umbrella.

Edmonton
- Any emergency in the region requires response that is going to address the specifics of the circumstance.

Calmar
- The issue of protective services is complex taking into consideration fire districts, fire co-ops, municipal boundaries.

Bon Accord
- We are already having problems with map lines.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- There is always a need for administrative areas to determine payment. Most municipalities already have mutual aid agreements in place to cover cross boundary response.

Parkland County
- Varying levels of service between municipalities and a municipality's ability to provide these services must be considered.

OTHER RESPONSES: 20 others responded.

AGREE
- Keep in mind that saving lives is most important.
- Emergency services especially should be delivered without boundaries. Response times are key and have been obstructed from common sense service delivery by municipal boundaries...
- I assume service requirements means response time.
- This assumes there will be no drop in level of service currently provided.
- Users do not consider map lines during an emergency.
- Sturgeon County is doing a large review.

DISAGREE
- The concept of "permeable boundaries" discussed in the report addresses service requirements based on intervention time and that municipalities should address the matter through the existing and potential mutual aid processes. This que....

SPECIFIED FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

2. Do you agree that regional risk profiles should be created to identify areas where there is opportunity for fire/emergency service improvement?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Bon Accord		●
Calmar		●
Gibbons		●
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Total 14	9	5
Others 18	16	2

COMMENTS

AGREE

Sturgeon County
- A resource and financial commitment from municipalities in the region is required to meet the risk of major emergencies. Regional governance may be required to combine multiple budgets and resources needs for the region. A regional business plan to address the risk for the region should address these issues and find remedies for implementation.

Strathcona County
- Who will fund the service improvements identified?

Thorsby
- Already happening in Leduc County.

Morinville
- Already doing. Participating in Regional Fire Plan.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Municipalities responsible for services can address this matter.

Parkland County
- Coordination of risk profiles already being done on a sub-regional basis through voluntary cooperation.
- The practical benefits of a risk profile for the entire region are questionable.

Gibbons
- This will be part of our Master Plan in this area.

OTHER RESPONSES - 18 others responded.

AGREE
- Some areas may be over-protected, some under-protected costing additional insurance dollars to the service recipients. Adjustments could be made in equipment, facility placement, training and personnel, management, etc....
- Services should be available equally and not have areas set as priorities.
- Assume this means looking for specific improvement.
- Improvements are always needed.

DISAGREE
- Intent of report was to create risk profiles to identify areas of risk that municipalities could and should cooperatively address on a regional basis, not areas of deficient service. If the risks are identified, the municipalities affected can add.....

SPECIFIED FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

3. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should create a regional business plan to address opportunities for improvements to fire and emergency services in the region?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Gibbons	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Leduc		●
Parkland Cty		●
Strathcona Cty		●
Munic 15	11	4
Others 19	16	3

COMMENTS

AGREE

Sturgeon County
- Currently developing a sub-regional master plan for emergency services in our area.
- Business plan should include participation and input from the Province. Consideration needs to be given to the financial implications.

Gibbons
- Agree with concept but do not like word "integration" - change to "cooperation."

Thorsby
- Already happening in Leduc County.

Edmonton
- Responses should be in accordance with a plan that involves all emergency services, and that also addresses the costs incurred by each municipality in responding to emergencies in other jurisdictions.
- Involving the various police services should be part of any program to have suitable emergency services in the region.

Morinville
- Member NRCAER. Doing through Sturgeon County Study. Developing a master plan.

Spruce Grove
- Less of a priority than relationship with the Province and "smart growth."

Bon Accord
- Agree with concept.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Municipalities and particularly adjacent municipalities can explore opportunities for improvements, however the need for regional integration seems remote.

Parkland County
- Any expansion to the current cooperation between municipalities in the provision of emergency services should be initiated and supported by the participating municipalities on a sub-regional basis.

Strathcona County
- Opportunities existing in specific areas (dangerous goods, risks assessment, training), but general fire services should not be included in any regional business plan.

OTHER RESPONSES: 19 others responded.

AGREE
- Provided Edmonton doesn't determine that it is the best at delivering a service prior to exploring what other municipalities do.
- A need that has been a long time coming. Tremendous opportunities for this approach, as well as cost savings. There will be a higher level of service delivery to businesses and citizens.
- Assuming no drop in current levels of service to all residents.
- Municipalities or provincial government?

DISAGREE
- Should be the role of a regional planning authority, not of 23 municipalities.
- Question too general. Concept was discussed for purpose of addressing "specified fire and emergency services" such as disaster response or fire prevention that have reasonably common or equal regional implications ...
- More wasted time. Let's cut the crap and fix what is most dysfunctional. Edmonton has the most to fix by size and structure. Last heard only 500 million needed.

SPECIFIED FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

4. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should coordinate recruitment of full time staff and purchases of major equipment?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Spruce Grove	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Gibbons	●	
Morinville	●	
Parkland Cty	●	
Redwater	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Warburg	●	
Beaumont		●
Bon Accord		●
Calmar		●
Leduc Cty		●
Leduc		●
Thorsby		●
Munic 13	7	6
Others 18	10	8

COMMENTS

AGREE

Sturgeon County
- Included in sub-regional master plan. Caution must be exercised when combining large purchases (creates a false demand from a small manufacturing market). May be value in municipalities staggering their purchases.
- Recruiting drives for emergency services personnel often compete for the same employee. Coordination through Alberta Fire Training School would ensure better and consistent supply of labour force. Controlling enrollment in training programs to meet future needs would enhance consistency of training and hiring levels.
- Include participation and input from Province. Consideration needs to be given to the financial implications.

Parkland County
- Not affected by recruitment of full-time firefighting personnel.
- Coordination of major equipment purchases could be further investigated to determine if it will produce any savings.

Strathcona County
- Coordinated timing of recruitment campaigns will reduce potential conflict. Coordinated purchasing will work as long as increased demand does not drive up prices.

Gibbons
- This is important for economies of scale.

Morinville
- Already being done.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Municipalities are already cooperating on selected material and equipment purchases. Don't see a synergy with respect to staffing.

Thorsby
- Staffing best determined at local level.

Bon Accord
- Too costly for small communities.

Note: Spruce Grove - Municipalities in region should coordinate recruitment of full time staff and purchases of equipment. Need to agree on what you want to do first.

OTHER RESPONSES: 18 others responded.

AGREE
- Already being done in our region.
- There are advantages to a more regional approach to recruitment of staff and equipment. Will improve standards for the region and could reduce equipment costs.
- Benefit of cost sharing and efficiencies in bulk purchases.
- Within their own municipalities.

DISAGREE
- Great cost savings are possible by having one regional authority plan and purchase these items.
- Question too general. Intent of report is for municipalities to network regarding recruitment and purchasing to avoid competing with each

other. Specific requirements concerning full-time staff and major equipment vary considerably ...

- How do we deal with the varying ability to pay across the region? Some departments cannot pay union scale based on Edmonton's costs.
- Assumption would be Edmonton. Strathcona County's training is of highest quality and needs to remain so for safety of the entire region. Don't believe substantial cost savings would transpire re equipment.
- Regional areas should coordinate their own staffing. Thinking in particular ERD especially the Ambulance division has a hard time attracting employees. Surrounding areas do not see to have the same problem.
- Full time staff-not for smaller municipalities-volunteers. Maybe the purchase of equipment could be coordinated.

SPECIFIED FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

5. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should coordinate training of staff in the region?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
Morinville	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Munic 13	11	2
Others 19	16	3

COMMENTS

AGREE

Sturgeon County
- Already a key component of sub-regional master plan.
- Alberta Fire Training School should coordinate this initiative. A regional Alberta Fire Training School in the capital region could better serve the needs of the fire service through day courses and training coordination.
- Include participation and input from the Province and industry.

Strathcona County
- A positive outcome and would support existing regional training initiatives, including working with industrial partners.

Leduc
- The Province should fund.

Gibbons
- Definitely should be done.

Warburg
- Training should include all volunteers involved in municipalities that rely on their services. Must be offered to accommodate the fact that many have full time jobs (not during the regular 9-5 work week)...

Spruce Grove
- Assuring similar standards.

Bon Accord
- A good idea.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Municipalities are already cooperating at a sub-regional level and interest in training extends even beyond the local area. We are attracting trainees from across the province.

Parkland County
- Currently happening on a voluntary and informal sub-regional basis.
- Additional outside funding and support would be required to be of any benefit to Parkland County.

OTHER RESPONSES: 19 others responded.

AGREE
- This would be highly effective.
- Costs should be borne fairly by all taxpayers.
- An area of proven benefits. On a regional basis even more benefits can be reached.
- Such efforts should help to ensure quality of service throughout region.
- Providing all specialized areas are taken into account. Not the majority of training just addressed to the urban environment.
- Share.
- If, and only if, there are cost savings.

DISAGREE
- Question subverts intent of report. Intent is for municipalities to network so that they are aware of each other's training calendars/initiatives so that they ....
- Bigger is not better, just bigger.
- Should be the role of a regional planning authority, not 23 municipalities. Stop wasting taxpayers' money by having this work done by 23 different staffs.

UTILITIES

Wastewater Management

1. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should develop a plan for future wastewater infrastructure replacement and operations in the region?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Gibbons	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Warburg	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Morinville	●	
Parkland Cty	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Thorsby		●
Munic 12	10	2
Others 14	12	2

COMMENTS

AGREE

Parkland County
- Should be developed using the existing authorities.

Strathcona County
- There are opportunities to utilize transmission and treatment capacity in the region. Where capacity shortfalls occur there may be solid rationale to look at system expansion from a regional perspective. Future needs and available options are currently reviewed by ACRWC.

Sturgeon County
- Support the existing structure and arrangements (agreement between City of Edmonton and ACRWC). This seems to work well.

Edmonton
- City of Edmonton has already developed plans for future infrastructure replacement and operation for the city.

Morinville
- ACRWC already doing.

Spruce Grove
- Partially done by ACRWC.

Bon Accord
- Assume this is going on now in all municipalities.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Through the Capital Region Wastewater Commission the member municipalities with a common collection and treatment facilities can and are attending to this already.

Thorsby
- Thorsby's infrastructure is adequate for present and foreseeable future.

OTHER RESPONSES: 14 others responded.

AGREE
- Such a plan would result in cost-effective wastewater management for the whole region.
- Extremely important as the environment is so important to our citizens and is increasing in importance.

DISAGREE
- Being a small village, we have invested in our own sewage and water systems.

UTILITIES

Wastewater Management

2. Do you agree that the cost of new wastewater infrastructure should be borne by the users who will benefit from the infrastructure?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Gibbons	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Warburg	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Leduc Cty	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Bon Accord		●
Morinville		●
Parkland Cty		●
Munic 12	9	3
Others 14	9	5

COMMENTS

AGREE

Strathcona County
- Generally agree. However, there may be situations where financial assistance from the Province may be necessary to meet environmental or service objectives.

Beaumont
- With the provision that the Province be involved vis-a-vis original startup of CRSC.

Edmonton
- The cost of new wastewater infrastructure should be borne by the users who will benefit from the infrastructure.

Redwater
- There should be serious consideration for provincial assistance for upgrade of existing as well as new infrastructure.

Calmar
- In addition, as is currently the practice, developers are responsible for new infrastructure.

Spruce Grove
- This necessitates a provincial responsibility as all users are residents of the province.

DISAGREE

Parkland County
- Users should bear some of the costs, but provincial participation is critical to any long term solution.

Bon Accord
- Would be too costly for smaller municipalities to do on their own.

OTHER RESPONSES: 14 others responded.

AGREE
- Agree and disagree. There is also a role for the provincial government to provide funds for infrastructure of this nature and the total cost should not be just with the users.
- Some public responsibility for these systems as well.
- With provincial support.

DISAGREE
- This is classified as a public work and is for the benefit of all.
- This clearly makes sense but is also something that the Province may need to assist in addressing. The means for municipalities to leverage taxes for such development may be limited, and I believe that the Province could play a significant role also.

UTILITIES

Water Treatment, Distribution and Delivery

3. Do you agree that the five water commissions should continue their role as purchasers of water, and continue to act as a buyer's group?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Thorsby	No response	
Warburg	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc Cty	●	
Morinville	●	
Parkland Cty	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty		●
Munic 11	10	1
Others 14	9	5

COMMENTS

AGREE

Strathcona County
- The one customer approach (Regional Water Customer Group) to purchasing waster has served the region well, evidenced by a long term supply agreement, stable bulk water rates, coordination of regional draw rates and a strong working relationship among members and EPCOR.

Redwater
- Consolidation of the five commissions should be looked into.

Bon Accord
- All commissions should be one.

Spruce Grove
- Support a single commission model (similar to ACRWC).
- Distribution would continue to be the responsibility of each municipality.

DISAGREE

Sturgeon County
- The commissions should be rolled into one (i.e., formalization of the regional water group).

Note: Thorsby - N/A - We are not a member.

OTHER RESPONSES: 14 others responded.
AGREE - No comment.

DISAGREE
- There should be one commission that plans and manages the water treatment, distribution and delivery for the region.
- How about a single body rather than five?

UTILITIES

Water Treatment, Distribution and Delivery

4. Do you agree that looking ahead 20 years, changes may be needed in the way that water is treated, distributed and delivered within the region?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
Parkland Cty	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Warburg	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Morinville		●
Munic 11	9	2
Others 13	10	3

COMMENTS

AGREE

Strathcona County
- A 20 year supply agreement is currently in place between EPCOR and the buyer's group. This is a strong commitment between purchaser and supplier on how we will continue to work together for our mutual benefit. Review for operating efficiencies is ongoing.

Thorsby
- Intense livestock operations with affect quality.

Gibbons
- See if there is an area for cost reduction.

Beaumont
- Perhaps a buy into Aqualta assisted by provincial funding.

Sturgeon County
- Treatment - Changing in environmental expectations. Distribution - more users online.

Redwater
- The removal of the softening agents is causing serious scaling and plugging of lines. This problem can't wait 20 years, it will have to be addressed sooner.

Calmar
- Alberta Environment and federal water quality regulations will drive this issue.

Bon Accord
- Providing it is either cost saving or at least the status quo.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Municipalities may wish to discuss possible integration.

Note: Parkland County - Pointless question. Who can say? This will depend on technology and costs.

OTHER RESPONSES: 13 others responded.

AGREE
- Population growth will ultimately create a need for expanding facilities and building new ones. We should be planning as a region and sharing costs as a region.
- Certainly technological changes designed to cut down on waste and improve efficiencies in delivery will have to be implemented.
- There should be one system for the region.
- Obviously more capacity, perhaps an expansion of the region served or perhaps new regional facilities upstream from the City of Edmonton.
- All water needs throughout region managed by a regional board.

DISAGREE - No comment.

UTILITIES

Solid Waste Management

5. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should develop a long term solid waste management plan for the region that identifies strategies beyond the life of current land fill sites?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Warburg	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Gibbons	●	
Morinville	●	
Parkland Cty	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Redwater		●
Sturgeon Cty		●
Munic 13	10	3
Others 13	11	2

COMMENTS

AGREE

Parkland County
- Strategies identified must be based on realistic costs for all municipalities.

Strathcona County
- Long range strategies will give a regional focus to solid waste issues. Strategies must take into account work done by the Capital Region Waste Minimization Committee. All landfill sites, including dry landfills, should be included in any analysis and strategy development.

Edmonton
- Long range plans for solid waste management are already in place and are being implemented.

Morinville
- Already doing.

Bon Accord
- Only if municipalities require it. Bon Accord and surrounding area are involved in a Regional Solid Waste Commission.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- No obvious argument for commonality of waste management between municipalities on the extremes of the region.

Sturgeon County
- Support status quo. Are currently establishing a sub-regional solid waste services commission, with five other municipalities.
- Can look after this in our micro-region.

OTHER RESPONSES: 13 others responded.

AGREE
- Such a plan is imperative; increasing population pressures will tax the current system to and past the limit.
- A regional solid waste management plan would be acceptable if sub regional arrangements were taken into account as there are many efficiencies now. Although there is room for improvement a long-term regional plan is required. this is an environmental ...
- Alternatives to landfills such as increased recycling programs and compost initiatives should be a high priority in the region.

DISAGREE - No comment.

UTILITIES

Solid Waste Management

6. Do you agree that in the future, changes may be needed in the way that solid waste is disposed of in the region?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Parkland Cty	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Warburg	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc Cty	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Munic 12	12	0
Others 12	10	2

COMMENTS

AGREE

Leduc County
- Monopolies are always a concern but the possibility seems remote.

Strathcona County
- New options should continue to be examined. Individual municipalities must have the opportunity to address the balance between environmental responsibility and economic reality before embracing any one waste management process or system.

Sturgeon County
- Depending upon technological advances and innovative ways yet to be identified.

Gibbons
- As a result of changes in technology.

Edmonton
- Future plans involve more diversion from landfill through recycling, composting and energy recovery.

Bon Accord
- Providing there are better technologies that come along.

Note: Pointless questions. Changes may or may not be needed depending on technology and costs in the future.

OTHER RESPONSES: 12 others responded.

AGREE
- Disposal by landfill sites will no longer be suitable.
- The objective should be to divert solid waste from the landfill stream. This will require education programs for the public and additional programs in many municipalities that address recycling initiatives in order to achieve the objective.

DISAGREE - No comment.

UTILITIES

Solid Waste Management

If you AGREE...

6a ...should disposal to existing landfills outside the Capital Region be considered?
6b. ...should new landfill capacity in the Capital Region be considered?
6c. ...should Edmonton co-composter use and expansion be considered?
6d. ...should regional sharing of recycle depots/compost facilities/eco stations be considered?
6e. ...should collective negotiation of waste collection agreements be considered?
6f. ...should a regional solid waste authority be considered?

	a		b		c		d		e		f	
Municipality	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
Devon	NSR											
Leduc Cty	NSR											
St. Albert	NSR											
Ft. Sask	No response											
Leduc	No response											
Legal	No response											
New Sarepta	No response											
Stony Plain	No response											
Warburg	No response											
Bon Accord							●					
Beaumont	●			●	●		●		●			●
Calmar			●		●		●				●	
Edmonton	●		●		●		●		●		●	
Gibbons		●	●				●			●		●
Morinville		●	●		●		●			●		
Parkland Cty	●		●		●		●		●		●	
Redwater		●		●	●		●			●		●
Spruce Grove	●		●			●	●		●		●	
Strathcona Cty	●		●		●		●		●		●	
Sturgeon Cty		●	●		●		●			●		●
Thorsby		●	●		●		●			●		●

	a		b		c		d		e		f	
	Yes	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
Munic	5	5	9	2	9	1	12		5	5	5	5
Others	5	2	7	2	10	0	10	0	8	0	9	1

COMMENTS

Parkland County
- All options can be looked at. Do not interpret this as support for all or any of them. The cost/benefit to each municipality must first be fully analyzed.

Strathcona County
- All options are worthy of consideration. Municipal autonomy, affordability and flexibility are philosophies that need to be embraced in any review of these options.

Edmonton
- All methods should be used to effect environmentally sound and economically feasible solid waste disposal.

Bon Accord
- Probably a mixture of 6a to 6f, providing it will be cost effective to all municipalities.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

1. Which one of the following terms is most acceptable to you?

Municipality	Growth management	Smart Growth	Growth Coordination	Sustainable Development	None of the above	Any of the above
Devon	NSR					
Edmonton	NSR					
St. Albert	NSR					
Stony Plain	NSR					
Ft. Sask	No response					
Legal	No response					
New Sarepta	No response					
Bon Accord			●			
Beaumont	●					
Calmar	●					
Gibbons	●					
Leduc	●					
Leduc Cty					●	
Morinville					●	
Parkland Cty					●	
Redwater						●
Spruce Grove		●				
Strathcona Cty			●			
Sturgeon Cty					●	
Thorsby	●					
Warburg					●	
Munic	5	1	2		5	1
Others	9	4	7	0	1	1

COMMENTS

SMART GROWTH

Spruce Grove

- All says the same thing. Some people very sensitive.

GROWTH COORDINATION

Strathcona County

- Implies autonomous partners working collaboratively to establish common goals and address common issues. Growth should be coordinated at the regional level and managed at the municipal level.

NONE OF THE ABOVE

Leduc County

- Do not provide insight into challenge of providing appropriate responsive planning.

Thorsby

- Regional planning. Development must be cautious as this region encompasses a wide variety of lifestyles, environments and landscapes.

Sturgeon County

- Cannot make a decision until such time as there are clear definitions.

Morinville

- Question not clear. Needs to be more specific.

Parkland County

- Question impossible to answer as terms not adequately defined. The Executive Summary is totally dedicated to selling the "Smart Growth" concept. The County has significant concerns with the tone of the smart growth options.

OTHER RESPONSES

REGIONAL PLANNING (3)

- I am sad to see cookie cutter suburbs springing up in all corners of the city. These new "neighbourhoods" need new roads, water lines, emergency services, schools, etc. all at a great cost to the city. Suburban sprawl also paves over agricultural lands ...

SMART GROWTH

- A major movement all across N. America has been the emphasis on smart growth, meaning ending sprawl and protecting ecosystem health and biodiversity.
- Smart growth means planning our communities so that our streets will be safer, our neighbourhoods will be nicer places to live, our air and water will be less polluted, and our parks, farms and open space will be protected.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

- What is to be accomplished is well set-out by these two words.
- Growth management is most acceptable because it leaves the impression that there are decision makers and issues pertaining to growth will be thoroughly thought out. It gives one a feeling of comfort and trust in the handling of issues within the region ...
- Let's call it what it is - the entire world calls it growth management. Whether you like it or not, that is what we are talking about.

NONE OF THE ABOVE

- The issue is not semantics, or the newest PC catch phrase. The issue is ensuring that growth is not occurring at the expense of the environment: how can we better use what we already have? How can we curb growth, yet build strength? How do we define ...?

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

2. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should coordinate growth issues at the regional level?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Parkland Cty	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Gibbons	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Warburg	No response	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
St. Albert	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Beaumont		●
Leduc		●
Leduc Cty		●
Sturgeon Cty		●
Thorsby		●
Munic 13	8	5
Others 25	16	9

COMMENTS

AGREE

Spruce Grove
- U.S. disasters testify to a lack of coordination. Growth based on lowest common denominator.
- Strongly support the need for "smart growth" in order that all of the region's population ultimately prospers.
- Work to date is theoretical but does highlight critical importance.
- A balance between bottom up (grass roots initiative) and top down will generate the optimum solution.
- This region has an opportunity to be the leader in this regard.

St. Albert
- Primary concern to the region and an issue of high priority.
- Essential to develop principles upon which future planning for growth can be managed.

Strathcona County
- Should be a balanced approach that looks at urban growth and rural growth as equal parts of the equation. Note: "coordinate regional growth issues at the regional level."

Edmonton
- One of the most critical issues to the future of the region. *Note: Edmonton submitted a separate paper on growth management.*

Redwater
- Theoretically, a good idea, implementation may be difficult.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The need for local knowledge in planning implementation is proven. While regional awareness is essential, regional coordination equates to another level of government. We are concerned that this concept can be used to control smaller urban and rural municipalities.

Leduc
- This is a governance question.

Thorsby
- Small municipalities will lose their voice.

Beaumont
- Depends on term regional. We handle growth issues very nicely with our neighbours regionally already. But quite frankly not sure our town is impacted or that we should comment on issues in Morinville.

Sturgeon County
- Rural municipalities and their urban partners can make bi-lateral and multi-lateral agreements pursuant to their individual requirements. We do not support a return to any regional planning regime (e.g., EMRPC).

Note: Gibbons - Agree and Disagree - what constitutes an issue?
Parkland County - Support the coordination of land use as presently laid out in the Municipal Government Act. The Executive Summary is slanted toward control of growth. We are strongly opposed to any mandated growth management/control regressing back to the old regional planning commission concept.

OTHER RESPONSES: 25 others responded.

AGREE

- If efforts aren't coordinated, we'll simply be "running off madly in all directions."
- They have to be coordinated at the regional level to provide efficient social services and solutions to expansion problems created by necessary annexation at someone else's expense.
- Many of the growth issues faced by the region cross over one or more municipal boundaries. There may be some merit in addressing growth from a sub-regional basis with a regional coordinating body.
- It is essential that coordination occurs. The former regional planning system in the Province conducted this activity. Growth strategy, utility corridors, transportation, environmental, and land conservation are elements that are very difficult to deal with ...
- Growth is not a bad thing, but it should be done sustainably.
- By coordinating growth issues, it is believed that we can protect our farmland and natural areas around Edmonton and the region more efficiently and effectively.

DISAGREE

- It is clear that 23 municipalities have been unable and unwilling to plan for regional smart growth. It is high time we had a regional planning authority to set out a long term vision of the region's ecosystem health and biodiversity goals ...
- Growth issues being handled well by small municipalities. Infrastructure and sustainable growth issues are large for Edmonton. Province needs to work on these issues as a priority.
- Agree with the general comment but hard to tell what is meant by this question. With the current situation in the capital region, each municipality has a blend of taxation capabilities. While the region needs to do more on coordination, each ...
- Local.

REGIONAL REPORT CARD

1. Do you agree that it is desirable to devise a way to measure and report our progress as a region from year to year?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
St. Albert	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Leduc		●
Parkland Cty		●
Strathcona Cty		●
Thorsby		●
Warburg		●
Munic 15	9	6
Others 20	15	5

COMMENTS

AGREE

Sturgeon County
- Appears to be appropriate relative to evaluating and measuring economic progress as well as quality of life.
- So that we have a ways and means of measuring tangible outcomes.

St. Albert
- It is equally important to collect and analyze the data on a sub-regional basis, and where the size of the community permits, on a municipality by municipality basis.

Gibbons
- Through communications.

Bon Accord
- Agree, but think year to year is too often.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- The scientific certainty of the model presented is certainly less than convincing and the ultimate utility suspect.

Parkland County
- Not practical as prepared.
- Impossible to measure regional progress with so many variables-would end up being an academic exercise.

Strathcona County
- Too frequent. Perhaps some general indicators that are commonly produced could be reviewed annually, but a comprehensive report should be presently every 3-5 years. The staff time and cost of annual reports is prohibitive to many municipalities. Perhaps tie to timing of federal census.

Thorsby
- Three years is sufficient.

Warburg
- Yearly report cards may cause citizens to become apathetic about answering whereas every 3-5 years would possibly be more effective.

OTHER RESPONSES: 20 others responded.

AGREE
- Especially the region's ecosystem health and maintenance of biodiversity as a measure of its health. See the work done by the Royal Commission on the Toronto Waterfront on concepts of ecosystem health and ways to measure it.
- If we don't know where we're going, how will we know if we ever get there?
- If such a measuring stick can be easily devised it would be a definite aid to improvements in the progress of the region.
- A regional progress report is beneficial to realize your successes, your weaknesses and what areas require more focus and attention. It can also be a great marketing tool for the region.
- Otherwise we have no idea of where we stand. For example, always thought the transportation cluster was strong...EDE's study tells us something else.
- This is the best way to view any changes that may have occurred through the integration of services and policies in the capital region.

We have no way at present to measure the performance of our elected officials against other local communities.

DISAGREE

- While it is desirable to report our performance, you can hardly be expected to grade yourselves without outside input and accountability.
- More waste. Spend on problems not on opinions.

REGIONAL REPORT CARD

2. Do you agree that it is desirable to devise a way to measure and report the performance of our region compared to other Canadian regions?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Bon Accord	NSR	
Devon	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	•	
Edmonton	•	
Gibbons	•	
Morinville	•	
Spruce Grove	•	
St. Albert	•	
Strathcona Cty	•	
Sturgeon Cty	•	
Thorsby	•	
Calmar		•
Leduc Cty		•
Leduc		•
Parkland Cty		•
Redwater		•
Warburg		•
Munic 15	9	6
Others 20	14	6

COMMENTS

AGREE

Spruce Grove
- Like the fact that this study builds on existing models.

St. Albert
- It is equally important to collect and analyze the data on a sub-regional basis, and where the size of the community permits, on a municipality by municipality basis.

Strathcona County
- This would be useful information but we should not focus on the region to the point of losing sight of the uniqueness of each municipality.

Sturgeon County
- To compare our region relative to the world economy. Imposed models vs. voluntary models and the ramifications, successes and failures of each.

Gibbons
- How will we know we are doing the right thing?

Thorsby
- If not at a huge cost to ratepayers.

Edmonton
- Measuring the region with other regions is valuable in directing all forms of action and resources. Of particular importance are those indicators that deal with the quality of life for residents. The work of Peter Faid and Working Group C should be used to set reporting standards for the entire region.
- Environment is a major element and regional in nature. Any report from the Chairman should also mentioned planning in the North Saskatchewan River Valley.
- Establishing what is suitable to be measured is the first step. Setting desirable goals can then follow.

Morinville
- Already done through a Capital Region Studies Centre at the University of Alberta.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Statistics are regularly gathered by Statistics Canada and private polling and marketing agencies - not necessary to reinvent the wheel.

Parkland County
- Not practical given significant differences in size and scope of other Canadian regions (especially if CMAs are used).

Warburg
- Not necessarily as each region is unique for many reasons: i.e., climate, terrain, substructure, proximity to national borders.

Calmar
- We are unique.

Note: Bon Accord - Is this not being done now through the U of A?

OTHER RESPONSES: 20 others responded.

AGREE
- Especially other regions that have regional planning authorities with resources to plan long-term visions and their implementation. Ontario's Regional Government Act, and the 13 specific regional acts have left Edmonton in the dust, and these regions sho...
- There's nothing like competition to keep us on our toes.

- Why integrate the region if it is not going to make us more competitive? We need to be able to compare ourselves to someone else.
- This can be a marketing tool, as well as an educational tool and a management tool when dealing with issues comparable to our region.
- Regions who develop "market intelligence" will be better suited to compete.
- There is presently no way to determine whether or not the region is progressing in relation to other areas (e.g., Calgary).

DISAGREE

- This isn't a race to see who is the best. If we focus on our region, while implementing effective strategies from outside the region, we will do better. Comparing ourselves to other municipalities may be unfair to them, or to us, because each region co...
- We have enough data. Spend on improvement, not more data.
- A comparison to another Canadian region, unless it is apples to apples, is a waste of time.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE REGION AND PROVINCE

1. Do you agree that the roles and responsibilities of provincial and municipal governments that are affected by regional initiatives should be clarified?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Gibbons	●	
Morinville	●	
Parkland Cty	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc		●
Leduc Cty		●
Munic 15	13	2
Others 18	18	0

COMMENTS

AGREE

Sturgeon County
- It is imperative that clarity is given in regard to this issue.

Beaumont
- Including a recognition of monetary responsibility and "partnership" of the Province.

Gibbons
- We should not be held accountable for someone else's responsibilities.

Edmonton
- An intermediate step is to clarify the relationship between the Province and the municipalities. Since the region is made up of numerous municipalities, it would be problematic to establish a relationship between provincial departments and the region when there is still a lack of role clarity at the municipal level.

Redwater
- Financial commitment from Province should also be clarified.

Spruce Grove
- Critical requirement.

Bon Accord
- The left hand has to know what the right hand is doing.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Premature until such time as [regional initiatives] are clarified

Leduc
- Unclear as to your meaning.

OTHER RESPONSES: 18 others responded.

AGREE
- Roles and responsibilities must be delineated with certainty to facilitate the processes concomitant with any regional initiatives.
- Absolutely necessary. There are too many grey areas and clear roles and responsibilities must be determined.
- Any initiative and regional efforts made in the capital region should be established accordingly in the MGA. This way, such initiatives are given jurisdiction and have legal backing.
- Is this not what we are doing with this review?

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE REGION AND PROVINCE

2. Do you agree that checks should be in place to ensure that regional integration does not lead to downloading of costs from provincial government to municipalities?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Sturgeon Cty	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Parkland Cty	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
St. Albert	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Munic 14	13	1
Others 17	16	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Parkland County
- Municipal government cannot cope with any more downloading of responsibilities/costs.

St. Albert
- Provinces should maintain their responsibilities and partner with municipalities in the delivery of properly funded services. Funding should be predictable and stable.

Beaumont
- We simply cannot afford a recurrence of what the Province has done to municipalities in the past. A provincial government with a huge surplus should not be building on that by simply making someone else foot the bill, i.e., municipalities. We could say to...

Gibbons
- Remove the word "integration."

Strathcona County
- Support putting checks in place to ensure no provincial downloading takes place, no matter what relationship exists between the municipalities in the region.
- The word "integration" should be replaced with coordination.

Thorsby
- Change regional integration to regional cooperation.

Spruce Grove
- Role clarification should resolve this.

Bon Accord
- It should be legislated not to download any more by the Province.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Extent of regional integration has not been identified, has not been the focus of our review from our perspective, and has not been supported by municipalities.

Note: Sturgeon County - Require clarification on what regional integration means, before we agree or disagree.

OTHER RESPONSES: 17 others responded.

AGREE
- This is being done at the present time.
- This is vital, especially where smaller municipalities are concerned.
- There is why there is a need for clarification.
- Depends - perhaps downloading is desirable in some instances.
- This should be established through the MGA.

DISAGREE
- During the last 10 years the Province has downloaded a considerable array of costs onto municipalities without expanding the revenue sources available to municipalities.

Additional comment: What regional integration?

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE REGION AND PROVINCE

3. Do you agree that municipal and provincial administrators should jointly create a regional business plan that identifies service delivery equipment and facility investments on a regional level?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Redwater	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	•	
Calmar	•	
Edmonton	•	
Gibbons	•	
Morinville	•	
Sturgeon Cty	•	
Warburg	•	
Bon Accord		•
Leduc		•
Leduc Cty		•
Parkland Cty		•
Spruce Grove		•
Strathcona Cty		•
Thorsby		•
Munic 14	7	7
Others 17	14	3

COMMENTS

AGREE

Warburg
- As long as individual community projects involving infrastructure don't suffer, i.e., internal municipal road maintenance.

Beaumont
- BUT when talking about fire and emergency services, we must recognize that cost of a volunteer fire department is pretty close to zero in comparison to a full time fire crew whose cost is substantially higher than zero. Secondly any pl...

Gibbons
- Agree in a perfect world. How do you stop turf protection?

Edmonton
- Business plans are of value provided they are in concert and are focussed upon achieving results that can be measured.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Municipalities have not yet agreed to any service equipment or facility investment into the region. It is not clear how provincial administrators have been insinuated into this process.

Parkland County
- Words such as "reorganization" and "new regional structure" lead to concern that there is a predetermined conclusion that the region needs restructuring which we thought was not an issue as stated on numerous occasions by the Province.

Strathcona County
- Intent is unclear and requires further discussion.

Leduc
- Sounds like regional governance.

Spruce Grove
- Issues of role of Province and growth management deserve our resources and time. Good idea, less of a priority.

Bon Accord
- Process too unclear at the present time.

OTHER RESPONSES: 17 others responded.

AGREE
- Providing that all have the opportunity and affordability to all future services.
- An inventory of equipment and facilities would provide the necessary overview which would allow efficient sharing between municipalities.
- Like any business, an inventory is required for all departments of equipment and facilities. This inventory should go beyond that - it should include an inventory of programs offered by the Province, education system, municipalities and the private sector...
- Right now we have no idea of what we have or what we are capable of. We need to go back to the concept of a hierarchy of plans as per the former Planning Act. i.e., Provincial Plan - The Planning Act, Regional Plan, Municipal Development Plan, Area Structure Plan, Land Use Bylaw. This was a good, logical system of planning...
- CEOs and maybe councillors should also be involved.

DISAGREE
- Work on Edmonton. Don't waste our time further.
- This approach leaves regional planning up to the municipal elected officials rather than seeking input from the 900,000 citizens who are so deeply affected by the current inefficiencies of 23 competing municipalities. It is time to hear dire ...

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE REGION AND PROVINCE

4. Do you agree that the provincial government should provide funding to support extraordinary costs associated with developing regional initiatives (systems, services or capacity)?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Gibbons	●	
Leduc Cty	●	
Leduc	●	
Morinville	●	
Parkland Cty	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Strathcona Cty	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Munic 15	15	0
Others 17	17	0

COMMENTS

AGREE

Leduc County
- Support project specific grant funding for cooperative inter-municipal research and ventures.

Parkland County
- Province needs to be a partner in any regional initiatives.
- Strongly recommend Province formally recognize municipal government as equal partners.

Strathcona County
- Provincial funding should support regional programs, but not be used as a means of controlling the direction of the initiative.

Warburg
- The funding should not impact on any funding already in place and committed to the communities involved.

Sturgeon County
- The Province should provide sustainable funding for projects, i.e. removal of education tax from property tax would enable municipalities greater manoeuverability on a regional basis.

Beaumont
- Most definitely. Nothing brings people to the table like provincial funds. Again one only has to go back in the not so distant past to see the buy in effected by funding 90/10 of CRSC

Leduc
- Only if any phase is implemented.

Thorsby and Bon Accord
- Eliminate "extraordinary."

Edmonton
- Provincial support for regional initiatives needs to be long term in nature, particularly where funding is involved.

OTHER RESPONSES: 17 others responded.

AGREE
- This is vital at all municipal levels but especially where the smaller municipalities (towns and villages) are involved.
- They have to be partners in all of this. They can not stand on the sidelines and be expected to make the right decisions.
- Initial support should be given to create effective and efficient regional initiatives.
- Assumption of integration prior to validation of cost savings and service improvement.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE REGION AND PROVINCE

5. Do you agree that cases where municipalities receive different per capita grants or costs, depending upon their designation and size, should be identified and addressed if they create barriers to regional integration?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Parkland Cty	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Gibbons	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Strathcona Cty	No response	
Sturgeon Cty	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Calmar	●	
Edmonton	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Bon Accord		●
Leduc		●
Leduc Cty		●
Munic 11	8	3
Others 15	14	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Warburg
- Smaller communities have more problems accessing monies available and most times are unable to capitalize on what is available.

Thorsby
- Change "integration" to "cooperation."

Spruce Grove
- Fundamental problem that has to be addressed.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Regional integration has not been a focus of this review. Flexibility is required to provide and delivery services on an equitable basis.

Leduc
- Poorly worded question.

Bon Accord
- Do not agree with "integration."

Note:
Strathcona County - Intent of question is unclear, requires discussion.
Sturgeon County - No response until "regional integration" is clarified.
Gibbons - There are no "unconditional" grants therefore should be no impact. What barrier would be created?

OTHER RESPONSES: 15 others responded.

AGREE
- Of course this is true but villages and towns must be treated as special cases because per capita grants are inadequate sources of funding where small populations are involved.
- There are inequities in revenue generation and funding allocation. These need to be identified and the Province needs to bring equity to these through Provincial legislation.
- The process has to be equitable to all.
- You would think this would be a fairly simple thing to do. Hopefully all the different communities can come up with a means of focusing their energies for the corporate good. I think that would entail finding a means to crate certain economic development ...

No Response: This should be done in an equitable way to all municipalities.

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TO SUPPORT REGIONAL INTEGRATION

1. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should develop principles to guide how costs will be shared when service delivery is integrated at a regional level?

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Warburg	●	
Bon Accord		●
Leduc Cty		●
Morinville		●
Parkland Cty		●
Strathcona Cty		●
Thorsby		●
Munic 13	7	6
Others 16	15	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Warburg
- Consideration of service delivery costs to individuals and municipalities must have a strong impact on decisions.

Sturgeon County
- Change the words "when service..." to "if service..."

Beaumont
- This should be for incremental services. Forget the idea of paying for each other's roadways, which is unfortunately where the debate inevitably goes. No pun intended but roads are a two way street and as much if not more traffic flows out of Edmonton...

Gibbons
- Change word "integrated" to cooperation.

Spruce Grove
- Always need a framework.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Municipalities are capable of negotiating and addressing cost implications of any service which they choose to share in the future.

Parkland County
- Infers that service integration is a foregone conclusion.
- Concepts are way ahead of what the regional governance review is all about.

Strathcona County
- Do not support regional integration. Support regional coordination, collaboration and cooperation.

Thorsby
- Change "integration" to "cooperation." We would want to continue the way things are already being developed.

Morinville
- Municipalities should agree when shared delivery should be integrated at a regional level.

Bon Accord
- Do not agree with the word "integration."

Note: Leduc - Believe these questions are premature at this time.

OTHER RESPONSES: 16 others responded.

AGREE
- Absolutely - principles must be developed.
- Actions of St. Albert council under the CITYPLAN process have highlighted the inability of St. Albert to think beyond its borders. Special interest groups representing less than 0.5% of the population have pushed their small minded agenda forward.

DISAGREE
- We need an elected regional planning authority with representation by population to do this. The regional whole is bigger than the sum of the regional parts, or municipalities, which tend to bring too narrow a view to the development of regional principles...

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS
TO SUPPORT REGIONAL INTEGRATION

2. Do you agree that a regional ombudsman office should be established to address all concerns about unfairness? The ombudsman would be guided by the principles developed by the municipalities in the region.

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Gibbons	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Warburg	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Redwater	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Calmar		●
Leduc Cty		●
Morinville		●
Parkland Cty		●
Spruce Grove		●
Strathcona Cty		●
Thorsby		●
Munic 11	4	7
Others 15	9	6

COMMENTS

AGREE

Bon Accord
- Providing they have some power or "teeth" to make a difference.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- This smacks of extra governmental authority and is absolutely beyond the scope of the review. The hidden agenda is revealed!

Parkland County
- Infers that service integration is a foregone conclusion.
- Concepts are way ahead of what the regional governance review is all about.

Strathcona County
- Do not support regional integration. Support regional coordination, collaboration and cooperation.

Thorsby
- Do not need another level of government.

Calmar
- However, there must be some way of achieving this without high costs to member municipalities, and a complex method of resolving disputes.

Spruce Grove
- What happened to role of the Province?

Notes:
Leduc - Believe these questions are premature at this time.
Gibbons - Who is going to pay? ACRA has conflict resolution concept in place.
Warburg - Reluctant to support the establishment of more bureaucracy.

OTHER RESPONSES: 15 others responded.

AGREE
- He/she will need some teeth. Somehow we need to establish a "higher authority" with the final say in order to settle disputes.
- An area that should be explored further. Would the ombudsman be guided by principles or legislation?

DISAGREE
- Need an elected regional planning authority with representation by population.
- We don't need any more layers of bureaucracy!
- Do not know if this is the answer...municipalities are quite capable of sorting out their own concerns.
- A system to address concerns should be in place at the management level. Do not complicate.

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TO SUPPORT REGIONAL INTEGRATION

3. Do you agree regional business plans that address service integration should define appropriate standards and assess alternate service delivery approaches? Volunteerism should be recognized in the system as an asset.

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
Morinville	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Strathcona Cty		●
Thorsby		●
Munic 12	8	4
Others 16	15	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Warburg
- Not all integration will be cost effective for all municipalities and residents nor will it necessarily provide better service.

Beaumont
- And recognize that we in smaller communities cannot afford to replace volunteers with paid staff (i.e., fire).

Gibbons
- Remove "integration." AUMA principles already cover this. If a municipality is forced to modify standards, the other municipality pays. Volunteers are definitely an asset.

Spruce Grove
- Let's not build a region based on volunteerism. We all recognize its importance.

Bon Accord
- Providing "integration" is not there. If it wasn't for our volunteers most small communities in the Province would not survive.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Regional business plans should not necessarily be developed. Municipalities are responsible for determining standards and funding services according to the wishes and ability to pay of the various communities. There is no apparent logical connection between a regional business plan and volunteerism.

Parkland County
- Infers that service integration is a foregone conclusion.
- Concepts are way ahead of what the regional governance review is all about.

Strathcona County
- Do not support regional integration. Support regional coordination, collaboration and cooperation.

Thorsby
- A dollar value should not be assigned to volunteerism. Standards may vary from municipality to municipality.

Note: Leduc - Believe these questions are premature at this time.
Morinville - Not clear - not an answerable question.

OTHER RESPONSES: 16 others responded.

AGREE
- Strongly agree with assessment review of alternate service methods. This is a must for our region.
- As long as each municipality has a say in how the service delivery is to be provided in their respective municipality, and it is not forced on them.

DISAGREE
- Usually volunteers in any planning process have their own agenda which skews the process.

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS
TO SUPPORT REGIONAL INTEGRATION

4. Do you agree that liability protection should be sought so that municipalities may provide services across municipal boundaries? This possibility of reducing overall cost of liability protection through shared liability coverage should be investigated.

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Beaumont	●	
Bon Accord	●	
Calmar	●	
Gibbons	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Spruce Grove	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Thorsby	●	
Warburg	●	
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Strathcona Cty		●
Munic 13	10	3
Others 16	15	1

COMMENTS

AGREE

Beaumont
- Most definitely. As an example, Beaumont is currently being used by a County of Leduc resident for attending a fire at their county residence. The resident was ecstatic to see us show up to fight the fire, but after the fire is now looking for someone to ....

Gibbons
- Agreements for the most part are in place.

Morinville
- Already done through AUMA.

Spruce Grove
- Common sense.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- There is no supportive information to suggest this is a problem or issue.

Parkland County
- Infers that service integration is a foregone conclusion.
- Concepts are way ahead of what the regional governance review is all about.

Strathcona County
- Do not support regional integration. Support regional coordination, collaboration and cooperation.

Note: Leduc - Believe these questions are premature at this time.

OTHER RESPONSES: 16 others responded.
AGREE - no comment.

DISAGREE
- Regional services should be provided by a regional planning authority, so municipal boundaries are not a problem.

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TO SUPPORT REGIONAL INTEGRATION

5. Do you agree that municipalities in the region should develop a human resource management plan for regional initiatives? The plan should inventory human resource demands upon municipalities, note positions, roles and responsibilities for various regional tasks, and identify the core competencies needed to support the region.

Municipality	Agree	Disagree
Bon Accord	NSR	
Devon	NSR	
Edmonton	NSR	
St. Albert	NSR	
Ft. Sask	No response	
Gibbons	No response	
Leduc	No response	
Legal	No response	
New Sarepta	No response	
Spruce Grove	No response	
Stony Plain	No response	
Warburg	No response	
Calmar	●	
Morinville	●	
Redwater	●	
Sturgeon Cty	●	
Beaumont		●
Leduc Cty		●
Parkland Cty		●
Strathcona Cty		●
Thorsby		●
Munic 9	4	5
Others 15	13	2

COMMENTS

AGREE

Morinville
- Done through ACRA.

DISAGREE

Leduc County
- Goes beyond anything discussed and beyond scope of review.

Parkland County
- Infers that service integration is a foregone conclusion.
- Concepts are way ahead of what the regional governance review is all about.

Strathcona County
- Do not support regional integration. Support regional coordination, collaboration and cooperation.

Beaumont
- Should be decided by AUTONOMOUS municipalities. The prime consideration in hiring someone is that they have "the core competencies" need to support responsibilities in our community.

Note: Leduc - Believe these questions are premature at this time.
Spruce Grove - Who pays? In this section it is hard to disagree but no discussion around the framework for using these options.

OTHER RESPONSES: 15 others responded.

AGREE
- Providing this does not create another level of government.
- Someone needs to assume responsibility and actually do the work. Without proper human resource infrastructure the greatest of ideas will remain just ideas.
- Unfortunately, this whole exercise seems to be one to create another layer of government which seems to be necessary because of the elimination of the Regional Planning Commissions. The RPCs did not cost much money to operate and provided an excellent se...

DISAGREE
- We need an elected regional planning authority with representation by population to do this.

Additional Comments

STAGE 4 STUDIES (in general)

Devon
- Concern about use of word "integration" instead of preferred word "cooperation."
- Will continue to support shared service opportunities when advantageous to municipalities.
- Support ACRA as a uniting force in the region.

Beaumont
- There needs to be a substantial amount of study done to determine the economic and/or financial efficiencies of change.

Sturgeon County
- Further study and evaluation needs to occur. "Due diligence" and substantiation of whatever models and/or systems evolve.

Spruce Grove
- There is merit in pursuing all the initiatives.

St. Albert
- Support the areas of study as areas of opportunity for regional efforts in the future. However, information from these studies should not be used to draw final conclusions or recommend specific options. We understand and expect these studies will receive more detailed review and analysis at the regional level at a later date.
- Encourage the initiation of a decision-making mechanism or framework to ensure the detailed review and analysis that is required is undertaken soon after submission of ACRGR final report.

Parkland County
- It appears the direction of the Review is to either set up a multitude of new authorities, or hire more consultants to study issues further-with the assumption that the Province is going to pay. Whether or not the Province will pay is a question unanswered. Also unanswered is who will bear the ongoing maintenance costs?
- Concerned that pre-conceived concepts are rationalized through statements not supported by practical examples.
- ACRA is a legitimate body to priorize and review many of the subject areas. ACRA should decide what are practical subjects and time lines for issues that may have an affect on the entire region.

Bon Accord
- Change the word "integration" to "cooperation."
- Before Province implements any of the report, all municipalities must be at the table.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

St. Albert
- Support direction taken by ACRA.

TRANSPORTATION

St. Albert
- Support direction taken by ACRA.

SPECIFIED FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

Spruce Grove
- Report needs more work.
- This study should have lower importance. There may be stronger opportunities for other regional improvements.

Sturgeon County
- A need exists for Critical Incident Stress Response programs for the emergency service providers of the region. Previously, Alberta Health provided this valuable service. Downloading this health service to the private sector has made the programs unavailable when needed and often cost prohibitive to municipalities.
- A thorough business plan is required to address all issues relating to regional emergency services. The ACRGR study was extremely narrow in scope (ambulance service and E9-1-1 were not considered).

Parkland County
- Either slanted toward a predetermined end, or require substantially more dollars to research, with undetermined benefits.

St. Albert
- Report goes beyond terms of reference. Complete analysis is necessary prior to recommending the development of a regional business plan for the full range of fire and emergency services. Who would develop the business plan? For whom and how does it fit into an overall "integration plan"?

Gibbons
- How do you get away from map lines relative to money (tax)? How would this be allocated? Patient care is of utmost importance.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

Sturgeon County

- Requires more study and analysis of "smart growth."
- Support ACRA embracing any growth management options.
- Do NOT support a legal entity controlling growth on a regional basis (e.g., EMRPC which did not meet the needs or requirements of rural residents).

St. Albert

- ACRGR final report should make a recommendation as to how principles for future planning for growth should be initiated and pursued.

Parkland County

- Either slanted toward a predetermined end, or require substantially more dollars to research, with undetermined benefits.

Spruce Grove

- The initiative around "smart growth" is paramount to the successful development of the region in the long term. Clearly a region cannot operate on a lowest common denominator basis in which individual communities can choose to ignore the interests of the region as a whole.

REGIONAL REPORT CARD

Parkland County

- Either slanted toward a predetermined end, or require substantially more dollars to research, with undetermined benefits.

REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK (GIS)

Parkland County

- Either slanted toward a predetermined end, or require substantially more dollars to research, with undetermined benefits.

Edmonton

- Edmonton has created and maintained an excellent system that serves civic administration and the partners who have contributed over the years. Edmonton's view is that the existing GBIS system and procedures can serve as the basis for a regional system. Building on successful systems should be the primary action; creating new systems should be optional; and benefits should accrue to municipalities that participate in the region wide system.
- The Province should use its influence to obtain as much compatibility within the Province as possible.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REGION AND PROVINCE

Spruce Grove

- A definition of the interrelationship between the Province and the municipalities is fundamental to the long-term sustainability of urban and rural municipalities. Work on the governance of any regional coordinating body-whether mandatory or not-remains critical.
- Generally support recommendations. The elimination of the paternal and pork barrel fringe elements of provincial policy will move this Province forward. A fundamental rethinking of provincial municipal relations is required to achieve equity for all citizens in the Province.

St. Albert

- Support implementation of four frameworks (growth management, environment, economic development, and social responsibilities).
- Funding of municipalities should be commensurate with their responsibilities, now and with the implementation of the four frameworks.

Edmonton

- The work of Group C should be a major input to this issue.

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TO SUPPORT REGIONAL INTEGRATION

Spruce Grove

- Mechanisms to remove barriers need to be identified. The Province should play a critical role in this regard.

Sturgeon County

- ACRA is well positioned to evaluate and move forward, together with the Province, with this evolving process

St. Albert

- What constitutes a barrier to regional integration depends on your perspective. The suggestion that altering boundaries is a way to reduce barriers prompts the question as to what boundary changes are being suggested and whether or not it includes municipal boundary changes.

Edmonton

- Regional issues need to be addressed and integration can be considered as a potential solution. Edmonton has always stressed cooperation, not mandatory integration.